



~~SECRET~~

COR-0273  
Copy 5 of 5

12 December 1958

MEMORANDUM FOR : Special Assistant to the Director  
for Planning and Development

SUBJECT : Evaluation of PIC Equipment List

REFERENCE (a) : Memo for Addressee, Subject: Equipment  
Programming and Anticipated Costs,  
Project C (CORONA-0272 dtd 9 Dec.1958)

(b) : Technical Proposal from ITEK, Subject:  
Proposal on a Ground Handling System  
dtd 28 Nov.1958 (CORONA-0249)

1. Reference (a) was received in the R&D Office during the late afternoon of 10 December. Reference (b) was personally presented on 1 December to our group by ITEK in the person of [redacted] Our group consisted of representatives from PIC and the Hqs. Staff. After the briefing and open discussion our group was of the opinion the ITEK proposal could not be accepted at that time.

2. The main reason for non-acceptance was:

- A. Omission of certain technical details within some of the tasks under Phase I;
- B. Terminology which indicated we would not get required capability;
- C. It was felt the timing of the Parameter Study (Phase II Task 1) was too early in the Project Schedule and consequently, the type of information needed would not be available to produce better equipments and techniques.

3. Keeping in mind the above findings and the many pitfalls which may limit the scope and duration of Project CORONA we requested [redacted] rewrite the proposal but limit it to Phase I only and in the process of rewriting to expand and clarify the various tasks. This he promised to do. However, to this date, no new proposal has been received.

25X1A

25X1A

**SECRET**

4. Reference (a) produced by PIC was discussed in rough draft form by both PIC and your R&D and Contract Staff members. Our guidelines were:

- A. Quality retention and accuracy, speed of analysis
- B. Costs
- C. Availability within allocated time
- D. Adaptability to other projects

The finished study (Reference (a)) reflects the result of the discussion.

5. A comparative study indicates the PIC approach gives more for our money than does the ITEK proposal. The PIC proposal has greater flexibility (i.e., ITEK equipments are limited to CORONA. PIC devices and techniques can be utilized for not only CORONA but for other future projects). A thorough study indicates we get quality, accuracy, and speed of analysis at least equal to or surpassing that of ITEK at less total cost. Both PIC and ITEK have stated equipments would be available at prescribed time.

6. As a result of Mr. Green's visit this afternoon (12 December), the following additional costs can be added to PIC Tab. A Category 1:

- A. Item 9 [redacted] (1 each)
- B. Cleaning Tables [redacted]

NRO  
25X1

Mr. Green has also submitted a budgetary estimate for CORONA materials and labor. This estimate will be submitted as a separate memorandum.

7. Recommendation:

- A. The PIC proposal be adopted.
- B. ITEK be given a go-ahead to produce only those items which are a part of the PIC study (i.e., Items 16, 38A & 38B).

DPS/DCI [redacted]:pf  
Distribution:

- Orig - Mr. Bissell
- 2 - Dir. R&P, DPS
- 3 - Contracts, DPS
- 4 - [redacted]
- ✓ 5 - Chrono, DPS